| STACE | EY QUINONES | | |
|-------|---|--|--|
| | Plaintiffs | CIVIL ACTION | |
| | V. | NO. <u>05-30135-MAP</u> | |
| TOWN | OF HOLLAND, et al., | NO. <u>05-50135-WAF</u> | |
| | Defendants | | |
| | | REFERENCE FOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION | |
| | TO JUDGE | Ponsor | |
| [X] | The above entitled case was reported sett | led after referral to the ADR Program, but prior to ADR. | |
| [X] | On February 13, 2007 I held the following | ng ADR proceeding: | |
| | SCREENING CONFERENCE | EARLY NEUTRAL EVALUATION | |
| | X MEDIATION | SUMMARY BENCH / JURY TRIAL | |
| | MINI-TRIAL | SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE | |
| | X The court held followup telephone con | ferences on February 20, 26, and 28, 2007 | |
| [X] | All parties were represented by counsel | | |
| [X] | The parties were present in person, by telephone or by authorized corporate officer or | | |
| | representative | | |
| | The case was: | | |
| [X] | Settled. A 60 day order of dismissal has l | been entered. | |
| [] | There was progress. | | |
| [] | Further efforts to settle this case at this time are, in my judgment, unlikely to be productive. This | | |
| | case should be restored to your trial list. | | |
| [] | Suggested strategy to facilitate settlement | : | |
| [] | Other: | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | ary 28, 2007 | /s/ Kenneth P. Neiman | |
| DATE | | ADR Provider | |
| | | KENNETH P. NEIMAN, Chief Magistrate Judge | |

| STACE | EY QUINONES | | |
|----------------|---|---|--|
| | Plaintiffs | CIVIL ACTION | |
| | V. | NO. 05-30135-MAP | |
| TOWN | OF HOLLAND, et al., | 110. <u>00 00 100 WW II</u> | |
| | Defendants | | |
| | | REFERENCE FOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION | |
| | TO JUDGE | Ponsor | |
| [X] | The above entitled case was reported sett | tled after referral to the ADR Program, but prior to ADR. | |
| [X] | On February 13, 2007 I held the following | ng ADR proceeding: | |
| | SCREENING CONFERENCE | EARLY NEUTRAL EVALUATION | |
| | X MEDIATION | SUMMARY BENCH / JURY TRIAL | |
| | MINI-TRIAL | SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE | |
| | X The court held followup telephone cor | nferences on February 20, 26, and 28, 2007 | |
| [X] | All parties were represented by counsel | | |
| [X] | The parties were present in person, by telephone or by authorized corporate officer or | | |
| | representative | | |
| | The case was: | | |
| [X] | Settled. A $\underline{60}$ day order of dismissal has | been entered. | |
| [] | There was progress. | | |
| [] | Further efforts to settle this case at this time are, in my judgment, unlikely to be productive. This | | |
| | case should be restored to your trial list. | | |
| [] | Suggested strategy to facilitate settlement | : | |
| [] | Other: | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Februa DATE | ary 28, 2007 | /s/ Kenneth P. Neiman ADR Provider | |
| DATE | | | |
| | | KENNETH P. NEIMAN, Chief Magistrate Judge | |

| STACE | EY QUINONES | | |
|-------------|---|---|--|
| | Plaintiffs | CIVIL ACTION | |
| | V. | NO. 05-30135-MAP | |
| <u>TOWN</u> | OF HOLLAND, et al., | 1101 <u>00 00 100 MM II</u> | |
| | Defendants | | |
| | | E: REFERENCE FOR EDISPUTE RESOLUTION | |
| | TO JUDG | E Ponsor | |
| [X] | The above entitled case was reported s | ettled after referral to the ADR Program, but prior to ADR. | |
| [X] | On February 13, 2007 I held the follow | wing ADR proceeding: | |
| | SCREENING CONFERENCE | EARLY NEUTRAL EVALUATION | |
| | X MEDIATION | SUMMARY BENCH / JURY TRIAL | |
| | MINI-TRIAL | SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE | |
| | X The court held followup telephone of | conferences on February 20, 26, and 28, 2007 | |
| [X] | All parties were represented by counsel | | |
| [X] | The parties were present in person, by telephone or by authorized corporate officer or | | |
| | representative | | |
| | The case was: | | |
| [X] | Settled. A 60 day order of dismissal ha | as been entered. | |
| [] | There was progress. | | |
| [] | Further efforts to settle this case at this time are, in my judgment, unlikely to be productive. This | | |
| | case should be restored to your trial list. | | |
| [] | Suggested strategy to facilitate settlement | ent: | |
| [] | Other: | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | ary 28, 2007 | /s/ Kenneth P. Neiman | |
| DATE | | ADR Provider | |
| | | KENNETH P. NEIMAN, Chief Magistrate Judge | |

| STACE | EY QUINONES | | |
|----------------|---|--|--|
| | Plaintiffs | CIVIL ACTION | |
| | V. | NO OF COACE MAD | |
| TOWN | I OF HOLLAND, et al., | NO. <u>05-30135-MAP</u> | |
| | Defendants | | |
| | | :: REFERENCE FOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION | |
| | TO JUDGE | Ponsor | |
| [X] | The above entitled case was reported se | ttled after referral to the ADR Program, but prior to ADR. | |
| [X] | On February 13, 2007 I held the follow | ing ADR proceeding: | |
| | SCREENING CONFERENCE | EARLY NEUTRAL EVALUATION | |
| | X MEDIATION | SUMMARY BENCH / JURY TRIAL | |
| | MINI-TRIAL | SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE | |
| | X The court held followup telephone co | nferences on February 20, 26, and 28, 2007 | |
| [X] | All parties were represented by counsel | | |
| [X] | The parties were present in person, by telephone or by authorized corporate officer or | | |
| | representative | | |
| | The case was: | | |
| [X] | Settled. A 60 day order of dismissal has | been entered. | |
| [] | There was progress. | | |
| [] | Further efforts to settle this case at this time are, in my judgment, unlikely to be productive. This | | |
| | case should be restored to your trial list. | | |
| [] | Suggested strategy to facilitate settlemen | nt: | |
| [] | Other: | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Februa DATE | ary 28, 2007 | /s/ Kenneth P. Neiman ADR Provider | |
| DATE | | | |
| | | KENNETH P. NEIMAN, Chief Magistrate Judge | |

| STAC | EY QUINONES | | |
|--------|---|---|--|
| | Plaintiffs | CIVIII ACTION | |
| | V. | CIVIL ACTION | |
| | 10511011 1115 | NO. <u>05-30135-MAP</u> | |
| IOWN | NOF HOLLAND, et al., Defendants | | |
| | | | |
| | | REFERENCE FOR ISPUTE RESOLUTION | |
| | TO JUDGE | Ponsor | |
| [X] | The above entitled case was reported settl | ed after referral to the ADR Program, but prior to ADR. | |
| [X] | On February 13, 2007 I held the following | g ADR proceeding: | |
| | SCREENING CONFERENCE | EARLY NEUTRAL EVALUATION | |
| | X MEDIATION | SUMMARY BENCH / JURY TRIAL | |
| | MINI-TRIAL | SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE | |
| | X The court held followup telephone con | ferences on February 20, 26, and 28, 2007 | |
| [X] | All parties were represented by counsel | | |
| [X] | The parties were present in person, by telephone or by authorized corporate officer or | | |
| | representative | | |
| | The case was: | | |
| [X] | Settled. A 60 day order of dismissal has b | peen entered. | |
| [] | There was progress. | | |
| [] | Further efforts to settle this case at this time are, in my judgment, unlikely to be productive. This | | |
| | case should be restored to your trial list. | | |
| [] | Suggested strategy to facilitate settlement: | | |
| [] | Other: | | |
| | | | |
| Februs | ary 28, 2007 | /s/ Kenneth P. Neiman | |
| DATE | | ADR Provider | |
| | | KENNETH P. NEIMAN, Chief Magistrate, Judge | |

| STAC | EY QUINONES | | |
|--------|---|---|--|
| | Plaintiffs | CIVIII ACTION | |
| | V. | CIVIL ACTION | |
| | 10511011 1115 | NO. <u>05-30135-MAP</u> | |
| IOWN | NOF HOLLAND, et al., Defendants | | |
| | | | |
| | | REFERENCE FOR ISPUTE RESOLUTION | |
| | TO JUDGE | Ponsor | |
| [X] | The above entitled case was reported settl | ed after referral to the ADR Program, but prior to ADR. | |
| [X] | On February 13, 2007 I held the following | g ADR proceeding: | |
| | SCREENING CONFERENCE | EARLY NEUTRAL EVALUATION | |
| | X MEDIATION | SUMMARY BENCH / JURY TRIAL | |
| | MINI-TRIAL | SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE | |
| | X The court held followup telephone con | ferences on February 20, 26, and 28, 2007 | |
| [X] | All parties were represented by counsel | | |
| [X] | The parties were present in person, by telephone or by authorized corporate officer or | | |
| | representative | | |
| | The case was: | | |
| [X] | Settled. A 60 day order of dismissal has b | peen entered. | |
| [] | There was progress. | | |
| [] | Further efforts to settle this case at this time are, in my judgment, unlikely to be productive. This | | |
| | case should be restored to your trial list. | | |
| [] | Suggested strategy to facilitate settlement: | | |
| [] | Other: | | |
| | | | |
| Februs | ary 28, 2007 | /s/ Kenneth P. Neiman | |
| DATE | | ADR Provider | |
| | | KENNETH P. NEIMAN, Chief Magistrate, Judge | |

| STAC | EY QUINONES | | |
|--------|---|---|--|
| | Plaintiffs | CIVIII ACTION | |
| | V. | CIVIL ACTION | |
| | 10511011 1115 | NO. <u>05-30135-MAP</u> | |
| IOWN | NOF HOLLAND, et al., Defendants | | |
| | | | |
| | | REFERENCE FOR ISPUTE RESOLUTION | |
| | TO JUDGE | Ponsor | |
| [X] | The above entitled case was reported settl | ed after referral to the ADR Program, but prior to ADR. | |
| [X] | On February 13, 2007 I held the following | g ADR proceeding: | |
| | SCREENING CONFERENCE | EARLY NEUTRAL EVALUATION | |
| | X MEDIATION | SUMMARY BENCH / JURY TRIAL | |
| | MINI-TRIAL | SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE | |
| | X The court held followup telephone con | ferences on February 20, 26, and 28, 2007 | |
| [X] | All parties were represented by counsel | | |
| [X] | The parties were present in person, by telephone or by authorized corporate officer or | | |
| | representative | | |
| | The case was: | | |
| [X] | Settled. A 60 day order of dismissal has b | peen entered. | |
| [] | There was progress. | | |
| [] | Further efforts to settle this case at this time are, in my judgment, unlikely to be productive. This | | |
| | case should be restored to your trial list. | | |
| [] | Suggested strategy to facilitate settlement: | | |
| [] | Other: | | |
| | | | |
| Februs | ary 28, 2007 | /s/ Kenneth P. Neiman | |
| DATE | | ADR Provider | |
| | | KENNETH P. NEIMAN, Chief Magistrate, Judge | |

| STAC | EY QUINONES | | |
|--------|---|---|--|
| | Plaintiffs | CIVIII ACTION | |
| | V. | CIVIL ACTION | |
| | 10511011 1115 | NO. <u>05-30135-MAP</u> | |
| IOWN | NOF HOLLAND, et al., Defendants | | |
| | | | |
| | | REFERENCE FOR ISPUTE RESOLUTION | |
| | TO JUDGE | Ponsor | |
| [X] | The above entitled case was reported settl | ed after referral to the ADR Program, but prior to ADR. | |
| [X] | On February 13, 2007 I held the following | g ADR proceeding: | |
| | SCREENING CONFERENCE | EARLY NEUTRAL EVALUATION | |
| | X MEDIATION | SUMMARY BENCH / JURY TRIAL | |
| | MINI-TRIAL | SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE | |
| | X The court held followup telephone con | ferences on February 20, 26, and 28, 2007 | |
| [X] | All parties were represented by counsel | | |
| [X] | The parties were present in person, by telephone or by authorized corporate officer or | | |
| | representative | | |
| | The case was: | | |
| [X] | Settled. A 60 day order of dismissal has b | peen entered. | |
| [] | There was progress. | | |
| [] | Further efforts to settle this case at this time are, in my judgment, unlikely to be productive. This | | |
| | case should be restored to your trial list. | | |
| [] | Suggested strategy to facilitate settlement: | | |
| [] | Other: | | |
| | | | |
| Februs | ary 28, 2007 | /s/ Kenneth P. Neiman | |
| DATE | | ADR Provider | |
| | | KENNETH P. NEIMAN, Chief Magistrate, Judge | |

| STAC | EY QUINONES | | |
|--------|---|---|--|
| | Plaintiffs | CIVIII ACTION | |
| | V. | CIVIL ACTION | |
| | 10511011 1115 | NO. <u>05-30135-MAP</u> | |
| IOWN | NOF HOLLAND, et al., Defendants | | |
| | | | |
| | | REFERENCE FOR ISPUTE RESOLUTION | |
| | TO JUDGE | Ponsor | |
| [X] | The above entitled case was reported settl | ed after referral to the ADR Program, but prior to ADR. | |
| [X] | On February 13, 2007 I held the following | g ADR proceeding: | |
| | SCREENING CONFERENCE | EARLY NEUTRAL EVALUATION | |
| | X MEDIATION | SUMMARY BENCH / JURY TRIAL | |
| | MINI-TRIAL | SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE | |
| | X The court held followup telephone con | ferences on February 20, 26, and 28, 2007 | |
| [X] | All parties were represented by counsel | | |
| [X] | The parties were present in person, by telephone or by authorized corporate officer or | | |
| | representative | | |
| | The case was: | | |
| [X] | Settled. A 60 day order of dismissal has b | peen entered. | |
| [] | There was progress. | | |
| [] | Further efforts to settle this case at this time are, in my judgment, unlikely to be productive. This | | |
| | case should be restored to your trial list. | | |
| [] | Suggested strategy to facilitate settlement: | | |
| [] | Other: | | |
| | | | |
| Februs | ary 28, 2007 | /s/ Kenneth P. Neiman | |
| DATE | | ADR Provider | |
| | | KENNETH P. NEIMAN, Chief Magistrate, Judge | |

| STACE | EY QUINONES | | |
|-------|---|--|--|
| | Plaintiffs | CIVIL ACTION | |
| | V. | NO. <u>05-30135-MAP</u> | |
| TOWN | OF HOLLAND, et al., | NO. <u>05-50135-WAF</u> | |
| | Defendants | | |
| | | REFERENCE FOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION | |
| | TO JUDGE | Ponsor | |
| [X] | The above entitled case was reported sett | led after referral to the ADR Program, but prior to ADR. | |
| [X] | On February 13, 2007 I held the following | ng ADR proceeding: | |
| | SCREENING CONFERENCE | EARLY NEUTRAL EVALUATION | |
| | X MEDIATION | SUMMARY BENCH / JURY TRIAL | |
| | MINI-TRIAL | SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE | |
| | X The court held followup telephone con | ferences on February 20, 26, and 28, 2007 | |
| [X] | All parties were represented by counsel | | |
| [X] | The parties were present in person, by telephone or by authorized corporate officer or | | |
| | representative | | |
| | The case was: | | |
| [X] | Settled. A 60 day order of dismissal has l | been entered. | |
| [] | There was progress. | | |
| [] | Further efforts to settle this case at this time are, in my judgment, unlikely to be productive. This | | |
| | case should be restored to your trial list. | | |
| [] | Suggested strategy to facilitate settlement | : | |
| [] | Other: | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | ary 28, 2007 | /s/ Kenneth P. Neiman | |
| DATE | | ADR Provider | |
| | | KENNETH P. NEIMAN, Chief Magistrate Judge | |

| STACE | EY QUINONES | | |
|----------------|---|---|--|
| | Plaintiffs | CIVIL ACTION | |
| | V. | NO OF SOASE MAD | |
| TOWN | I OF HOLLAND, et al., | NO. <u>05-30135-MAP</u> | |
| | Defendants | | |
| | | : REFERENCE FOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION | |
| | TO JUDGE | Ponsor | |
| [X] | The above entitled case was reported set | tled after referral to the ADR Program, but prior to ADR. | |
| [X] | On February 13, 2007 I held the following | ng ADR proceeding: | |
| | SCREENING CONFERENCE | EARLY NEUTRAL EVALUATION | |
| | X MEDIATION | SUMMARY BENCH / JURY TRIAL | |
| | MINI-TRIAL | SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE | |
| | X The court held followup telephone cor | nferences on February 20, 26, and 28, 2007 | |
| [X] | All parties were represented by counsel | | |
| [X] | The parties were present in person, by telephone or by authorized corporate officer or | | |
| | representative | | |
| | The case was: | | |
| [X] | Settled. A 60 day order of dismissal has | been entered. | |
| [] | There was progress. | | |
| [] | Further efforts to settle this case at this time are, in my judgment, unlikely to be productive. This | | |
| | case should be restored to your trial list. | | |
| [] | Suggested strategy to facilitate settlemen | t: | |
| [] | Other: | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Februa DATE | ary 28, 2007 | /s/ Kenneth P. Neiman ADR Provider | |
| DATE | | | |
| | | KENNETH P. NEIMAN, Chief Magistrate Judge | |

| STAC | EY QUINONES | | |
|--------|---|---|--|
| | Plaintiffs | CIVIII ACTION | |
| | V. | CIVIL ACTION | |
| | 10511011 1115 | NO. <u>05-30135-MAP</u> | |
| IOWN | NOF HOLLAND, et al., Defendants | | |
| | | | |
| | | REFERENCE FOR ISPUTE RESOLUTION | |
| | TO JUDGE | Ponsor | |
| [X] | The above entitled case was reported settl | ed after referral to the ADR Program, but prior to ADR. | |
| [X] | On February 13, 2007 I held the following | g ADR proceeding: | |
| | SCREENING CONFERENCE | EARLY NEUTRAL EVALUATION | |
| | X MEDIATION | SUMMARY BENCH / JURY TRIAL | |
| | MINI-TRIAL | SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE | |
| | X The court held followup telephone con | ferences on February 20, 26, and 28, 2007 | |
| [X] | All parties were represented by counsel | | |
| [X] | The parties were present in person, by telephone or by authorized corporate officer or | | |
| | representative | | |
| | The case was: | | |
| [X] | Settled. A 60 day order of dismissal has b | peen entered. | |
| [] | There was progress. | | |
| [] | Further efforts to settle this case at this time are, in my judgment, unlikely to be productive. This | | |
| | case should be restored to your trial list. | | |
| [] | Suggested strategy to facilitate settlement: | | |
| [] | Other: | | |
| | | | |
| Februs | ary 28, 2007 | /s/ Kenneth P. Neiman | |
| DATE | | ADR Provider | |
| | | KENNETH P. NEIMAN, Chief Magistrate, Judge | |

| STACE | EY QUINONES | | |
|----------------|---|---|--|
| | Plaintiffs | CIVIL ACTION | |
| | V. | NO OF SOASE MAD | |
| TOWN | I OF HOLLAND, et al., | NO. <u>05-30135-MAP</u> | |
| | Defendants | | |
| | | : REFERENCE FOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION | |
| | TO JUDGE | Ponsor | |
| [X] | The above entitled case was reported set | tled after referral to the ADR Program, but prior to ADR. | |
| [X] | On February 13, 2007 I held the following | ng ADR proceeding: | |
| | SCREENING CONFERENCE | EARLY NEUTRAL EVALUATION | |
| | X MEDIATION | SUMMARY BENCH / JURY TRIAL | |
| | MINI-TRIAL | SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE | |
| | X The court held followup telephone cor | nferences on February 20, 26, and 28, 2007 | |
| [X] | All parties were represented by counsel | | |
| [X] | The parties were present in person, by tel | lephone or by authorized corporate officer or | |
| | representative | | |
| | The case was: | | |
| [X] | Settled. A 60 day order of dismissal has | been entered. | |
| [] | There was progress. | | |
| [] | Further efforts to settle this case at this tir | me are, in my judgment, unlikely to be productive. This | |
| | case should be restored to your trial list. | | |
| [] | Suggested strategy to facilitate settlemen | t: | |
| [] | Other: | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Februa DATE | ary 28, 2007 | /s/ Kenneth P. Neiman ADR Provider | |
| DATE | | | |
| | | KENNETH P. NEIMAN, Chief Magistrate Judge | |

| <u>STACI</u> | EY QUINONES | | |
|--------------|---|---|--|
| | Plaintiffs | CIVIII ACTION | |
| | V. | CIVIL ACTION | |
| T0\44 | LOE HOLLAND | NO. <u>05-30135-MAP</u> | |
| TOWN | N OF HOLLAND, et al., Defendants | | |
| | | | |
| | | : REFERENCE FOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION | |
| | TO JUDGE | Ponsor | |
| [X] | The above entitled case was reported set | tled after referral to the ADR Program, but prior to ADR. | |
| [X] | On February 13, 2007 I held the following | ng ADR proceeding: | |
| | SCREENING CONFERENCE | EARLY NEUTRAL EVALUATION | |
| | X MEDIATION | SUMMARY BENCH / JURY TRIAL | |
| | MINI-TRIAL | SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE | |
| | X The court held followup telephone con | nferences on February 20, 26, and 28, 2007 | |
| [X] | All parties were represented by counsel | | |
| [X] | The parties were present in person, by telephone or by authorized corporate officer or | | |
| | representative | | |
| | The case was: | | |
| [X] | Settled. A 60 day order of dismissal has | been entered. | |
| [] | There was progress. | | |
| [] | Further efforts to settle this case at this time are, in my judgment, unlikely to be productive. This | | |
| | case should be restored to your trial list. | | |
| [] | Suggested strategy to facilitate settlemen | t: | |
| [] | Other: | | |
| | | | |
| Fahrus | ary 28, 2007 | /s/ Kenneth P. Neiman | |
| DATE | | ADR Provider | |
| | | KENNETH P. NEIMAN, Chief Magistrate, Judge | |

| STACE | EY QUINONES | | |
|-------------|---|---|--|
| | Plaintiffs | CIVIL ACTION | |
| | V. | NO. <u>05-30135-MAP</u> | |
| <u>TOWN</u> | I OF HOLLAND, et al., | 140. <u>00-30135-WAI</u> | |
| | Defendants | | |
| | | : REFERENCE FOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION | |
| | TO JUDGE | Ponsor | |
| [X] | The above entitled case was reported set | tled after referral to the ADR Program, but prior to ADR. | |
| [X] | On February 13, 2007 I held the followi | ng ADR proceeding: | |
| | SCREENING CONFERENCE | EARLY NEUTRAL EVALUATION | |
| | X MEDIATION | SUMMARY BENCH / JURY TRIAL | |
| | MINI-TRIAL | SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE | |
| | X The court held followup telephone cor | nferences on February 20, 26, and 28, 2007 | |
| [X] | All parties were represented by counsel | | |
| [X] | The parties were present in person, by telephone or by authorized corporate officer or | | |
| | representative | | |
| | The case was: | | |
| [X] | Settled. A 60 day order of dismissal has | been entered. | |
| [] | There was progress. | | |
| [] | Further efforts to settle this case at this time are, in my judgment, unlikely to be productive. This | | |
| | case should be restored to your trial list. | | |
| [] | Suggested strategy to facilitate settlement | t: | |
| [] |] Other: | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | ary 28, 2007 | /s/ Kenneth P. Neiman | |
| DATE | | ADR Provider | |
| | | KENNETH P. NEIMAN, Chief Magistrate Judge | |

| STACE | EY QUINONES | | |
|---------------|---|--|--|
| | Plaintiffs | CIVIL ACTION | |
| | V. | NO. 05-30135-MAP | |
| TOWN | OF HOLLAND, et al., | | |
| | Defendants | | |
| | <u>REPORT RE: RE</u> <u>ALTERNATIVE DIS</u> | EFERENCE FOR PUTE RESOLUTION | |
| | TO JUDGE <u>F</u> | Ponsor | |
| [X] | The above entitled case was reported settled | after referral to the ADR Program, but prior to ADR. | |
| [X] | On February 13, 2007 I held the following | ADR proceeding: | |
| | SCREENING CONFERENCE | EARLY NEUTRAL EVALUATION | |
| | X MEDIATION | SUMMARY BENCH / JURY TRIAL | |
| | MINI-TRIAL | SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE | |
| | X The court held followup telephone conference | ences on February 20, 26, and 28, 2007 | |
| [X] | All parties were represented by counsel | | |
| [X] | The parties were present in person, by teleph | one or by authorized corporate officer or | |
| | representative | | |
| | The case was: | | |
| [X] | Settled. A 60 day order of dismissal has been | en entered. | |
| [] | There was progress. | | |
| [] | Further efforts to settle this case at this time are, in my judgment, unlikely to be productive. This | | |
| | case should be restored to your trial list. | | |
| [] | Suggested strategy to facilitate settlement: | | |
| [] | Other: | | |
| | | | |
| <u>Februa</u> | ary 28, 2007 | /s/ Kenneth P. Neiman | |
| DATE | | ADR Provider | |
| | | KENNETH P. NEIMAN, Chief Magistrate Judge | |

| STACE | EY QUINONES | | |
|-------|---|--|--|
| | Plaintiffs | CIVIL ACTION | |
| | V. | NO. <u>05-30135-MAP</u> | |
| TOWN | OF HOLLAND, et al., | NO. <u>05-50135-WAF</u> | |
| | Defendants | | |
| | | REFERENCE FOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION | |
| | TO JUDGE | Ponsor | |
| [X] | The above entitled case was reported sett | led after referral to the ADR Program, but prior to ADR. | |
| [X] | On February 13, 2007 I held the following | ng ADR proceeding: | |
| | SCREENING CONFERENCE | EARLY NEUTRAL EVALUATION | |
| | X MEDIATION | SUMMARY BENCH / JURY TRIAL | |
| | MINI-TRIAL | SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE | |
| | X The court held followup telephone con | ferences on February 20, 26, and 28, 2007 | |
| [X] | All parties were represented by counsel | | |
| [X] | The parties were present in person, by telephone or by authorized corporate officer or | | |
| | representative | | |
| | The case was: | | |
| [X] | Settled. A 60 day order of dismissal has l | been entered. | |
| [] | There was progress. | | |
| [] | Further efforts to settle this case at this time are, in my judgment, unlikely to be productive. This | | |
| | case should be restored to your trial list. | | |
| [] | Suggested strategy to facilitate settlement | : | |
| [] |] Other: | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | ary 28, 2007 | /s/ Kenneth P. Neiman | |
| DATE | | ADR Provider | |
| | | KENNETH P. NEIMAN, Chief Magistrate Judge | |

| STACE | EY QUINONES | | |
|-------------|---|---|--|
| | Plaintiffs | CIVIL ACTION | |
| | V. | NO. <u>05-30135-MAP</u> | |
| <u>TOWN</u> | I OF HOLLAND, et al., | 140. <u>00-30135-WAI</u> | |
| | Defendants | | |
| | | : REFERENCE FOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION | |
| | TO JUDGE | Ponsor | |
| [X] | The above entitled case was reported set | tled after referral to the ADR Program, but prior to ADR. | |
| [X] | On February 13, 2007 I held the followi | ng ADR proceeding: | |
| | SCREENING CONFERENCE | EARLY NEUTRAL EVALUATION | |
| | X MEDIATION | SUMMARY BENCH / JURY TRIAL | |
| | MINI-TRIAL | SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE | |
| | X The court held followup telephone cor | nferences on February 20, 26, and 28, 2007 | |
| [X] | All parties were represented by counsel | | |
| [X] | The parties were present in person, by telephone or by authorized corporate officer or | | |
| | representative | | |
| | The case was: | | |
| [X] | Settled. A 60 day order of dismissal has | been entered. | |
| [] | There was progress. | | |
| [] | Further efforts to settle this case at this time are, in my judgment, unlikely to be productive. This | | |
| | case should be restored to your trial list. | | |
| [] | Suggested strategy to facilitate settlement | t: | |
| [] |] Other: | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | ary 28, 2007 | /s/ Kenneth P. Neiman | |
| DATE | | ADR Provider | |
| | | KENNETH P. NEIMAN, Chief Magistrate Judge | |

| STACE | EY QUINONES | | |
|----------------|---|---|--|
| | Plaintiffs | CIVIL ACTION | |
| | V. | | |
| TOWN | I OF HOLLAND, et al., | NO. <u>05-30135-MAP</u> | |
| <u>10001</u> | Defendants | | |
| | | E: REFERENCE FOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION | |
| | TO JUDGE | E Ponsor | |
| [X] | The above entitled case was reported se | ettled after referral to the ADR Program, but prior to ADR. | |
| [X] | On February 13, 2007 I held the follow | wing ADR proceeding: | |
| | SCREENING CONFERENCE | EARLY NEUTRAL EVALUATION | |
| | X MEDIATION | SUMMARY BENCH / JURY TRIAL | |
| | MINI-TRIAL | SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE | |
| | X The court held followup telephone co | onferences on February 20, 26, and 28, 2007 | |
| [X] | All parties were represented by counsel | | |
| [X] | The parties were present in person, by telephone or by authorized corporate officer or | | |
| | representative | | |
| | The case was: | | |
| [X] | Settled. A 60 day order of dismissal ha | s been entered. | |
| [] | There was progress. | | |
| [] | Further efforts to settle this case at this time are, in my judgment, unlikely to be productive. This | | |
| | case should be restored to your trial list. | | |
| [] | Suggested strategy to facilitate settleme | ent: | |
| [] | Other: | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Februa DATE | ary 28, 2007 | <u>/s/ Kenneth P. Neiman</u> ADR Provider | |
| DATE | | | |
| | | KENNETH P. NEIMAN, Chief Magistrate Judge | |

| STACE | EY QUINONES | | |
|--------|--|---|--|
| | Plaintiffs | CIVIII ACTIONI | |
| | V. | CIVIL ACTION | |
| T0\4/1 | | NO. <u>05-30135-MAP</u> | |
| TOWN | I OF HOLLAND, et al., Defendants | | |
| | | | |
| | | : REFERENCE FOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION | |
| | TO JUDGE | Ponsor | |
| [X] | The above entitled case was reported set | tled after referral to the ADR Program, but prior to ADR. | |
| [X] | On February 13, 2007 I held the following | ng ADR proceeding: | |
| | SCREENING CONFERENCE | EARLY NEUTRAL EVALUATION | |
| | X MEDIATION | SUMMARY BENCH / JURY TRIAL | |
| | MINI-TRIAL | SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE | |
| | X The court held followup telephone cor | nferences on February 20, 26, and 28, 2007 | |
| [X] | All parties were represented by counsel | | |
| [X] | The parties were present in person, by telephone or by authorized corporate officer or | | |
| | representative | | |
| | The case was: | | |
| [X] | Settled. A 60 day order of dismissal has | been entered. | |
| [] | There was progress. | | |
| [] | Further efforts to settle this case at this tin | ne are, in my judgment, unlikely to be productive. This | |
| | case should be restored to your trial list. | | |
| [] | Suggested strategy to facilitate settlement | t: | |
| [] | Other: | | |
| | | | |
| Eobrus | ony 28 2007 | /c/ Konnoth D. Noiman | |
| DATE | ary 28, 2007 | /s/ Kenneth P. Neiman ADR Provider | |
| | | KENNETH P. NEIMAN, Chief Magistrate Judge | |

| STACE | EY QUINONES | | |
|----------------|---|---|--|
| | Plaintiffs | CIVIL ACTION | |
| | V. | NO OF SOASE MAD | |
| TOWN | I OF HOLLAND, et al., | NO. <u>05-30135-MAP</u> | |
| | Defendants | | |
| | | : REFERENCE FOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION | |
| | TO JUDGE | Ponsor | |
| [X] | The above entitled case was reported set | tled after referral to the ADR Program, but prior to ADR. | |
| [X] | On February 13, 2007 I held the following | ng ADR proceeding: | |
| | SCREENING CONFERENCE | EARLY NEUTRAL EVALUATION | |
| | X MEDIATION | SUMMARY BENCH / JURY TRIAL | |
| | MINI-TRIAL | SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE | |
| | X The court held followup telephone cor | nferences on February 20, 26, and 28, 2007 | |
| [X] | All parties were represented by counsel | | |
| [X] | The parties were present in person, by tel | lephone or by authorized corporate officer or | |
| | representative | | |
| | The case was: | | |
| [X] | Settled. A 60 day order of dismissal has | been entered. | |
| [] | There was progress. | | |
| [] | Further efforts to settle this case at this tir | me are, in my judgment, unlikely to be productive. This | |
| | case should be restored to your trial list. | | |
| [] | Suggested strategy to facilitate settlemen | t: | |
| [] | Other: | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Februa DATE | ary 28, 2007 | /s/ Kenneth P. Neiman ADR Provider | |
| DATE | | | |
| | | KENNETH P. NEIMAN, Chief Magistrate Judge | |

| STACE | EY QUINONES | | |
|---------------|---|---|--|
| | Plaintiffs | CIVIII ACTIONI | |
| | V. | CIVIL ACTION | |
| TO:44 | LOT HOLLAND | NO. <u>05-30135-MAP</u> | |
| TOWN | I OF HOLLAND, et al., Defendants | | |
| | | | |
| | | RE: REFERENCE FOR EDISPUTE RESOLUTION | |
| | TO JUDG | E Ponsor | |
| [X] | The above entitled case was reported s | ettled after referral to the ADR Program, but prior to ADR. | |
| [X] | On February 13, 2007 I held the follo | wing ADR proceeding: | |
| | SCREENING CONFERENCE | EARLY NEUTRAL EVALUATION | |
| | X MEDIATION | SUMMARY BENCH / JURY TRIAL | |
| | MINI-TRIAL | SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE | |
| | X The court held followup telephone of | conferences on February 20, 26, and 28, 2007 | |
| [X] | All parties were represented by counse | I | |
| [X] | The parties were present in person, by telephone or by authorized corporate officer or | | |
| | representative | | |
| | The case was: | | |
| [X] | Settled. A 60 day order of dismissal ha | as been entered. | |
| [] | There was progress. | | |
| [] | Further efforts to settle this case at this time are, in my judgment, unlikely to be productive. This | | |
| | case should be restored to your trial list. | | |
| [] | Suggested strategy to facilitate settleme | ent: | |
| [] | Other: | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| <u>Februa</u> | ary 28, 2007 | /s/ Kenneth P. Neiman | |
| DATE | | ADR Provider | |
| | | KENNETH P. NEIMAN, Chief Magistrate Judge | |

| STACE | EY QUINONES | | |
|---------------|---|--|--|
| | Plaintiffs | CIVIL ACTION | |
| | V. | NO. 05-30135-MAP | |
| TOWN | OF HOLLAND, et al., | | |
| | Defendants | | |
| | <u>REPORT RE: RE</u> <u>ALTERNATIVE DIS</u> | EFERENCE FOR PUTE RESOLUTION | |
| | TO JUDGE <u>F</u> | Ponsor | |
| [X] | The above entitled case was reported settled | after referral to the ADR Program, but prior to ADR. | |
| [X] | On February 13, 2007 I held the following | ADR proceeding: | |
| | SCREENING CONFERENCE | EARLY NEUTRAL EVALUATION | |
| | X MEDIATION | SUMMARY BENCH / JURY TRIAL | |
| | MINI-TRIAL | SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE | |
| | X The court held followup telephone conference | ences on February 20, 26, and 28, 2007 | |
| [X] | All parties were represented by counsel | | |
| [X] | The parties were present in person, by teleph | one or by authorized corporate officer or | |
| | representative | | |
| | The case was: | | |
| [X] | Settled. A 60 day order of dismissal has been | en entered. | |
| [] | There was progress. | | |
| [] | Further efforts to settle this case at this time are, in my judgment, unlikely to be productive. This | | |
| | case should be restored to your trial list. | | |
| [] | Suggested strategy to facilitate settlement: | | |
| [] | Other: | | |
| | | | |
| <u>Februa</u> | ary 28, 2007 | /s/ Kenneth P. Neiman | |
| DATE | | ADR Provider | |
| | | KENNETH P. NEIMAN, Chief Magistrate Judge | |

| STACE | EY QUINONES | | |
|---------------|---|--|--|
| | Plaintiffs | CIVIL ACTION | |
| | V. | NO. 05-30135-MAP | |
| TOWN | OF HOLLAND, et al., | | |
| | Defendants | | |
| | <u>REPORT RE: RE</u> <u>ALTERNATIVE DIS</u> | EFERENCE FOR PUTE RESOLUTION | |
| | TO JUDGE <u>F</u> | Ponsor | |
| [X] | The above entitled case was reported settled | after referral to the ADR Program, but prior to ADR. | |
| [X] | On February 13, 2007 I held the following | ADR proceeding: | |
| | SCREENING CONFERENCE | EARLY NEUTRAL EVALUATION | |
| | X MEDIATION | SUMMARY BENCH / JURY TRIAL | |
| | MINI-TRIAL | SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE | |
| | X The court held followup telephone conference | ences on February 20, 26, and 28, 2007 | |
| [X] | All parties were represented by counsel | | |
| [X] | The parties were present in person, by teleph | one or by authorized corporate officer or | |
| | representative | | |
| | The case was: | | |
| [X] | Settled. A 60 day order of dismissal has been | en entered. | |
| [] | There was progress. | | |
| [] | Further efforts to settle this case at this time are, in my judgment, unlikely to be productive. This | | |
| | case should be restored to your trial list. | | |
| [] | Suggested strategy to facilitate settlement: | | |
| [] | Other: | | |
| | | | |
| <u>Februa</u> | ary 28, 2007 | /s/ Kenneth P. Neiman | |
| DATE | | ADR Provider | |
| | | KENNETH P. NEIMAN, Chief Magistrate Judge | |

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

| STACE | EY QUINONES | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| | Plaintiffs | CIVIL ACTION | |
| | V. | | |
| TOWN | I OF HOLLAND, et al., | NO. <u>05-30135-MAP</u> | |
| | Defendants | | |
| | REPORT RE: RE ALTERNATIVE DISP | | |
| | TO JUDGE Po | onsor | |
| [X] | The above entitled case was reported settled a | after referral to the ADR Program, but prior to ADR. | |
| [X] On February 13, 2007 I held the following ADR proceeding: | | DR proceeding: | |
| | SCREENING CONFERENCE | EARLY NEUTRAL EVALUATION | |
| | X MEDIATION | SUMMARY BENCH / JURY TRIAL | |
| | MINI-TRIAL | SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE | |
| | X The court held followup telephone confere | nces on February 20, 26, and 28, 2007 | |
| [X] | All parties were represented by counsel | | |
| [X] | The parties were present in person, by telephone or by authorized corporate officer or | | |
| | representative | | |
| | The case was: | | |
| [X] | Settled. A 60 day order of dismissal has been | n entered. | |
| [] | There was progress. | | |
| [] | Further efforts to settle this case at this time at | re, in my judgment, unlikely to be productive. This | |
| | case should be restored to your trial list. | | |
| [] | Suggested strategy to facilitate settlement: | | |
| [] | Other: | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Februa DATE | ary 28, 2007 | /s/ Kenneth P. Neiman ADR Provider | |
| DATE | | | |
| | | KENNETH P. NEIMAN, Chief Magistrate Judge | |

| <u>STACI</u> | EY QUINONES | | |
|--------------|--|---|--|
| | Plaintiffs | CIVIII ACTION | |
| | V. | CIVIL ACTION | |
| T0\44 | LOE HOLLAND | NO. <u>05-30135-MAP</u> | |
| TOWN | N OF HOLLAND, et al., Defendants | | |
| | | | |
| | | : REFERENCE FOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION | |
| | TO JUDGE | Ponsor | |
| [X] | The above entitled case was reported set | tled after referral to the ADR Program, but prior to ADR. | |
| [X] | On February 13, 2007 I held the following | ng ADR proceeding: | |
| | SCREENING CONFERENCE | EARLY NEUTRAL EVALUATION | |
| | X MEDIATION | SUMMARY BENCH / JURY TRIAL | |
| | MINI-TRIAL | SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE | |
| | X The court held followup telephone con | nferences on February 20, 26, and 28, 2007 | |
| [X] | All parties were represented by counsel | | |
| [X] | The parties were present in person, by telephone or by authorized corporate officer or | | |
| | representative | | |
| | The case was: | | |
| [X] | Settled. A 60 day order of dismissal has | been entered. | |
| [] | There was progress. | | |
| [] | Further efforts to settle this case at this tir | me are, in my judgment, unlikely to be productive. This | |
| | case should be restored to your trial list. | | |
| [] | Suggested strategy to facilitate settlemen | t: | |
| [] | Other: | | |
| | | | |
| Fahrus | ary 28, 2007 | /s/ Kenneth P. Neiman | |
| DATE | | ADR Provider | |
| | | KENNETH P. NEIMAN, Chief Magistrate Judge | |

| STACE | EY QUINONES | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| | Plaintiffs | CIVIL ACTION | |
| | V. | NO. <u>05-30135-MAP</u> | |
| TOWN | I OF HOLLAND, et al., | NO. <u>00-30133-WAF</u> | |
| | Defendants | | |
| | | E: REFERENCE FOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION | |
| | TO JUDGE | Ponsor | |
| [X] | The above entitled case was reported se | ttled after referral to the ADR Program, but prior to ADR. | |
| [X] On February 13, 2007 I held the following ADR proceeding: | | ing ADR proceeding: | |
| | SCREENING CONFERENCE | EARLY NEUTRAL EVALUATION | |
| | X MEDIATION | SUMMARY BENCH / JURY TRIAL | |
| | MINI-TRIAL | SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE | |
| | X The court held followup telephone co | nferences on February 20, 26, and 28, 2007 | |
| [X] | All parties were represented by counsel | | |
| [X] | The parties were present in person, by telephone or by authorized corporate officer or | | |
| | representative | | |
| | The case was: | | |
| [X] | Settled. A 60 day order of dismissal has | been entered. | |
| [] | There was progress. | | |
| [] | Further efforts to settle this case at this ti | me are, in my judgment, unlikely to be productive. This | |
| | case should be restored to your trial list. | | |
| [] | Suggested strategy to facilitate settlemen | nt: | |
| [] | Other: | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | ary 28, 2007 | /s/ Kenneth P. Neiman | |
| DATE | | ADR Provider | |
| | | KENNETH P. NEIMAN, Chief Magistrate Judge | |

| STACE | EY QUINONES | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| | Plaintiffs | CIVIL ACTION | |
| | V. | NO. <u>05-30135-MAP</u> | |
| TOWN | I OF HOLLAND, et al., | NO. <u>00-30133-WAF</u> | |
| | Defendants | | |
| | | E: REFERENCE FOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION | |
| | TO JUDGE | Ponsor | |
| [X] | The above entitled case was reported se | ttled after referral to the ADR Program, but prior to ADR. | |
| [X] On February 13, 2007 I held the following ADR proceeding: | | ing ADR proceeding: | |
| | SCREENING CONFERENCE | EARLY NEUTRAL EVALUATION | |
| | X MEDIATION | SUMMARY BENCH / JURY TRIAL | |
| | MINI-TRIAL | SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE | |
| | X The court held followup telephone co | nferences on February 20, 26, and 28, 2007 | |
| [X] | All parties were represented by counsel | | |
| [X] | The parties were present in person, by telephone or by authorized corporate officer or | | |
| | representative | | |
| | The case was: | | |
| [X] | Settled. A 60 day order of dismissal has | been entered. | |
| [] | There was progress. | | |
| [] | Further efforts to settle this case at this ti | me are, in my judgment, unlikely to be productive. This | |
| | case should be restored to your trial list. | | |
| [] | Suggested strategy to facilitate settlemen | nt: | |
| [] | Other: | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | ary 28, 2007 | /s/ Kenneth P. Neiman | |
| DATE | | ADR Provider | |
| | | KENNETH P. NEIMAN, Chief Magistrate Judge | |

| <u>STACI</u> | EY QUINONES | | |
|--------------|--|---|--|
| | Plaintiffs | CIVIII ACTION | |
| | V. | CIVIL ACTION | |
| T0\44 | LOE HOLLAND | NO. <u>05-30135-MAP</u> | |
| TOWN | N OF HOLLAND, et al., Defendants | | |
| | | | |
| | | : REFERENCE FOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION | |
| | TO JUDGE | Ponsor | |
| [X] | The above entitled case was reported set | tled after referral to the ADR Program, but prior to ADR. | |
| [X] | On February 13, 2007 I held the following | ng ADR proceeding: | |
| | SCREENING CONFERENCE | EARLY NEUTRAL EVALUATION | |
| | X MEDIATION | SUMMARY BENCH / JURY TRIAL | |
| | MINI-TRIAL | SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE | |
| | X The court held followup telephone con | nferences on February 20, 26, and 28, 2007 | |
| [X] | All parties were represented by counsel | | |
| [X] | The parties were present in person, by telephone or by authorized corporate officer or | | |
| | representative | | |
| | The case was: | | |
| [X] | Settled. A 60 day order of dismissal has | been entered. | |
| [] | There was progress. | | |
| [] | Further efforts to settle this case at this tir | me are, in my judgment, unlikely to be productive. This | |
| | case should be restored to your trial list. | | |
| [] | Suggested strategy to facilitate settlemen | t: | |
| [] | Other: | | |
| | | | |
| Fahrus | ary 28, 2007 | /s/ Kenneth P. Neiman | |
| DATE | | ADR Provider | |
| | | KENNETH P. NEIMAN, Chief Magistrate Judge | |

| STACE | EY QUINONES | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| | Plaintiffs | CIVIL ACTION | |
| | V. | NO. 05-30135-MAP | |
| TOWN | OF HOLLAND, et al., | | |
| | Defendants | | |
| | <u>REPORT RE: RE</u> <u>ALTERNATIVE DIS</u> | | |
| | TO JUDGE <u>F</u> | Ponsor | |
| [X] | The above entitled case was reported settled | after referral to the ADR Program, but prior to ADR. | |
| [X] On February 13, 2007 I held the following ADR proceeding: | | ADR proceeding: | |
| | SCREENING CONFERENCE | EARLY NEUTRAL EVALUATION | |
| | X MEDIATION | SUMMARY BENCH / JURY TRIAL | |
| | MINI-TRIAL | SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE | |
| | X The court held followup telephone conference | ences on February 20, 26, and 28, 2007 | |
| [X] | All parties were represented by counsel | | |
| [X] | The parties were present in person, by telephone or by authorized corporate officer or | | |
| | representative | | |
| | The case was: | | |
| [X] | Settled. A 60 day order of dismissal has been | en entered. | |
| [] | There was progress. | | |
| [] | Further efforts to settle this case at this time a | are, in my judgment, unlikely to be productive. This | |
| | case should be restored to your trial list. | | |
| [] | Suggested strategy to facilitate settlement: | | |
| [] | Other: | | |
| | | | |
| | ary 28, 2007 | /s/ Kenneth P. Neiman | |
| DATE | | ADR Provider | |
| | | KENNETH P. NEIMAN, Chief Magistrate Judge | |